Attorney Docket No. 2075/US/2

REMARKS

In accordance with the aforenoted Office communication, claims 68-75 were allowed, claims 1, 2,16-23, 26, 27, 33-35, 41, 43-46, 52, 53, and 60 were rejected based on prior art, and claims 3-15, 24, 28-32, 36-40, 42, 47-51, 54-59, and 62-67 were objected to as containing allowable subject matter but being dependent upon a rejected base claim or intervening claim. The allowance of claims 68-75 is acknowledged, the claims which were rejected have been amended and discussed with Examiner Johnson in a telephone interview on March 13, 2006, which interview was greatly appreciated, and the claims which were objected to have been rewritten as will be delineated hereafter so as to no longer be dependent upon a rejected base claim or intervening claim and are therefore felt to be in allowable form.

First of all, with regard to the claims which were objected to, claims 3, 24, 28, 31, 36, 39, 42, 47, 50, 54, 57, 59, 62, 65, and 67 have been rewritten as new claims 76-97, respectively, according to the following schedule:

Old Claim	New Claim
3/1	76
3/2	77
24	78
28/26	79
28/27	80
31	81
36/34	82
36/35	83

Attorney Docket No. 2075/US/2

84 85 86
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97

Some of the claims cancelled were multiple dependent claims and therefore necessitated the addition of two new claims corresponding to the one cancelled claim. Where claims were dependent upon a cancelled claim, they have been amended to depend from the replacement new claim or claims. Accordingly, all of the new claims 76-97, as well as the claims that are now dependent thereon, are felt to be in allowable form.

03/15/2006 12:35 FAX 3036293450

Of the rejected claims, claims 1, 26, 34, 43, 52, and 60-are independent. Each of these claims has been amended to specify the control system for the claimed covering drivingly rotates the head roller in both first and second directions and wherein the input assembly for the covering includes a single operating element and is operative to convert linear motion of the operating element into reversible driven rotational motion of a first motion transfer element. The claims have been further amended to be consistent with the above with the intent being to specify the control system in the covering drives the covering in both in an extended and retracted motion which is believed to patentably distinguish the claimed subject matter from the prior art.

Without getting into great specificity, the examiner rejected the noted claims in the application based on the teachings in the Colson '131 patent and the Fraczek patent. It is to be noted the Colson '131 patent utilizes a control system that is driven in one direction to retract the covering but the covering extends under the influence of gravity and is therefore not driven in both a retracting and extending direction. The Fraczek et al. patent discloses a system that uses a rotating control element as opposed to a control element that is linearly moved as in the present invention and, accordingly, is not felt to be suggestive or anticipatory of the claims as now amended.

Inasmuch as the claims in the application have now been amended to either be clearly patentably distinct from the prior art, to remove their dependency from a rejected base claim, or have been previously allowed, it is felt the claims are now in allowable form.

There not being any other objections or rejections to the application, it is felt it is in condition for allowance and such action is courteously requested.

Ø 046/046 Ø 002/002 PAGE Ø2

Attorney Docket No. 2075/US/2

Any additional claim fees due may be charged to Deposit Account 04-1415.

Dated this 15th day of March 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

GARY M POLUMBUS

Gary M. Polumbus, Reg. No. 25,364

USPTO Customer No. 20586

Tel: (303) 628-1500 Fax: (303) 629-3450

GMP/dtc

BEST AVAILABLE COPY